

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

229



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,269	04/02/2001	Yoshiyuki Takaku	450100-03144	1000
20999	7590	08/13/2004	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			CASIANO, ANGEL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/824,269	Applicant(s) TAKAKU ET AL.	
	Examiner Angel L. Casiano	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Fritz M. Fleming
FRITZ FLEMING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The present Office action is in response to Amendment dated 23 May 2004.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 May 2004 has been entered.

Priority

2. The present application claims Priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). Acknowledgement is made of Priority date set as 04 April 2000.

Specification

3. Previous Objection to the Title has been overcome with the Amendment filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilhooley et al. [GB 2275800 A] in view of Staats [US 6,618,750 B1] in further view of Hamlin [US 6,735,693 B1].

Regarding claim 1, Gilhooley et al teaches an information processing system (see Abstract). The cited reference includes a control device as well as sub-information processing devices (see Figure 1). Figures 1 and 10-13 from the cited disclosure expose a plurality of terminals for connecting devices. Gilhooley et al teaches storing name data, indicating the name of the terminals as well as name data transmission means (see Page 9, lines 10-12; Page 21, "claim 2"). Name data is received and displayed in the cited reference (see Page 20). Although the cited disclosure by Gilhooley et al does not explicitly include an *amplifier*, it does teach a processing device for *amplifying* the signals received from the terminals (see Page 6, lines 7-8). In addition, the reference does not explicitly cite "a main information processing device (amplifier) controlled by a control device (computer) through a communication means". Nonetheless, the reference does teach an amplifier, in communication with a control device, as well as with sub-information processing devices (see Page 5, lines 18-20). However, the cited prior art does not

Art Unit: 2182

explicitly teach a *serial* bus as communication means for communicating the “main information processing device” and “control device” in the system. In consideration of this aspect of the claim, Staats teaches an information processing system (see “Abstract”) including a main information device (inherent, see “local node”) to be controlled (see “controlling application”). The cited information processing device includes terminals for connecting the sub-information processing devices (see Fig. 2) with a predetermined connection (serial bus, see “IEEE 1394”). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to specify a serial bus as part of the Gilhooley et al. system. Specifically, Staats explicitly exposes that this type of serial bus is “the convergence bus bringing together the worlds of PC and digital consumer electronics” (see col. 1, lines 14-20). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the digital interface of choice for consumer digital audio/video applications. The combination of references teaches name data as well as manufacturer information (see Gilhooley et al.). However, the cited combination fails to teach “unique chip numbers”. Regarding this limitation, Hamlin teaches unique chip identifiers (see col. 1, lines 50-57). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination of references by including a unique chip ID, in order to implement validation procedures (see Hamlin).

As for claim 2, Gilhooley et al. teaches a control device (see Figures 1, 10-13). The reference also teaches selection means for selecting the name of the terminal corresponding to a user’s input operation (see Abstract; Pages 2-3). Name data is received and displayed in the cited reference (see Pages 3 and 20).

Art Unit: 2182

As for claim 3, Gilhooley et al. does not explicitly teach memory means for changing the name data. Nonetheless, it does teach *confirmation* of the name data (see Page 2, line 25; Fig. 3A). The cited information is stored after is it confirmed (Fig. 3A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the user would have been able to *change* instead of *confirming* the identification information, for the purposes of controlling the applications.

Regarding claim 4, Gilhooley et al teaches an information processing system. The reference includes a control device (see Figure 1). Figures 1 and 10-13 from the cited disclosure expose a plurality of terminals for connecting devices. Gilhooley et al teaches storing (*memorizing*) name data, indicating the name of the terminals as well as name data transmission means (see Page 9, lines 10-12; Page 21, “claim 2”). Name data is received and transmitted in the cited reference (see Page 20). Although the cited disclosure by Gilhooley et al does not explicitly include an *amplifier*, it does teach a processing device for *amplifying* the signals received from the terminals (see Page 6, lines 7-8). In addition, the reference does not explicitly teach, “a main information processing device (amplifier) controlled by a control device (computer) through a communication means”, as claimed. Examiner respectfully submits that the reference does teach an amplifier, in communication with a control device, as well as with sub-information processing devices (see Page 5, lines 18-20). However, the cited prior art does not explicitly teach a *serial* bus as communication means for communicating the “main information processing device” and “control device” in the system. In consideration of this aspect of the claim, Staats teaches an information processing system (see “Abstract”) including a main information device (inherent,

Art Unit: 2182

see “local node”) to be controlled (see “controlling application”). The cited information processing device includes terminals for connecting the sub-information processing devices (see Fig. 2) with a predetermined connection (serial bus, see “IEEE 1394”). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to specify a serial bus as part of the Gilhooley et al. system. Specifically, Staats explicitly exposes that this type of serial bus is “the convergence bus bringing together the worlds of PC and digital consumer electronics” (see col. 1, lines 14-20). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the digital interface of choice for consumer digital audio/video applications. The combination of references teaches name data as well as manufacturer information (see Gilhooley et al.). However, the cited combination fails to teach “unique chip numbers”. Regarding this limitation, Hamlin teaches unique chip identifiers (see col. 1, lines 50-57). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination of references by including a unique chip ID, in order to implement validation procedures (see Hamlin).

As for claim 5, Gilhooley et al. teaches a control device (see Figures 1, 10-13). The reference also teaches selection means for selecting the name of the terminal corresponding to a user’s input operation (see Abstract; Pages 2-3). Name data is received and displayed in the cited reference (see Pages 3 and 20). However, the cited reference does not explicitly teach *switching an input/output*, as claimed. Staats teaches a system where it chooses (e.g. switches) the terminal indicated by the identification data for input/output purposes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the cited references in order to use the digital interface of choice for consumer digital audio/video applications.

Art Unit: 2182

As for claim 6, Gilhooley et al. does not explicitly teach memory means for changing the name data. Nonetheless, it does teach *confirmation* of the name data (see Page 2, line 25; Fig. 3A). The cited information is stored after is it confirmed (Fig. 3A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the user would have been able to *change* instead of *confirming* the identification information, for the purposes of controlling the applications.

Regarding claim 7, this is oriented to the control device (see *computer*) in the information processing system formed by connecting a plurality of information processing devices and a control device. The combination of references (Gilhooley et al. in view of Staats, in further view of Hamlin) teaches the information processing system including the claimed control device (see rejections for claims 1-6). Therefore, the combination of prior art teaches the control device, as disclosed in the present claim. Claim 7 is rejected under the same basis.

As for claim 8, this is oriented to the control device in claim 7. As stated above, the combination of prior art teaches the information processing system including the claimed control device. Accordingly, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 9, this constitutes the information processing method in an information processing system comprised of a main information processing device, a control device, and a plurality of sub-information processing devices to be connected to the main information processing device. As stated above, Gilhooley et al. in view of Staats, in further view of Hamlin

Art Unit: 2182

teaches the information processing system presented in claims 1-3. Therefore, the references teach the method directed to the cited system. Claims 1-3 have been rejected in the present Office action and claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale.

As for claims 10 and 11, these are oriented to the information processing method as defined in claim 9. Claim 9 is being rejected in the present Office action, since it directs to the method for the information processing system disclosed by the combination of prior art. Accordingly, claims 10 and 11 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 12, this discloses an information processing method for the information processing device in the information processing system disclosed by the combination of references and rejected in claims 4-6. Claims 4-6 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gilhooley et al. in view of Staats, in further view of Hamlin. Accordingly, the cited combination teaches the information processing method for the cited device in the system. Claim 12 is therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 13 and 14 constitute the information processing method for the device in system. As stated above, the combination of references teaches the information processing device in the information processing system, as claimed. The present claims are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2182

Regarding claim 15, this discloses a control method for the control device in the information processing system taught by the combination of references and rejected in claim 7. Claim 7 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of prior art, since the cited art teaches the control device. Accordingly, it also teaches the control method for the cited device in the processing system. Therefore, the present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

In consideration of claim 16, this constitutes the control method for the control device in the information processing system disclosed by the combination of references and previously rejected in claim 8. The combination of prior art teaches the control device in the information processing system, as claimed. The present claim is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Ignatowski et al. [US 6,457,100 B1] teaches a scaleable computer system having unique processor chip identifier (ID).
- Shiga [US 6,457,100] unique ID in a computer system.
- Lewis [US 5,734,819] teaches method and apparatus for validating system operation.

Art Unit: 2182

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel L. Casiano whose telephone number is 703-305-8301. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

alc
06 August 2004.


FRITZ FLEMING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100